



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/769,154	01/24/2001	David C. Henkemeyer	42390P10676	5249

21906 7590 10/18/2004

TROP PRUNER & HU, PC
8554 KATY FREEWAY
SUITE 100
HOUSTON, TX 77024

EXAMINER

CAO, DIEM K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2126

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/769,154

Applicant(s)

HENKEMEYER, DAVID C.

Examiner

Diem K Cao

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 August 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 9-18 and 29-31 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 19, 20, 26 and 27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 21-25 and 28 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-31 remain in the application. Applicant has amended claim 6.

Allowable Subject Matter

2. Claims 9-18 and 29-31 are allowed.
3. Claims 21-25 and 28 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 does not point out and claim the purpose or use of the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Merkin (U.S. 5,715,463).

8. **As to claim 26**, Merkin teaches an operating system including a plurality of interfaces to equipment of a corresponding plurality types (a plurality of device drivers ... to data processing system; col. 4, lines 50-59), one of which is the first predetermined type (display; col. 4, lines 50-59), and including a driver ID demander (the operating system), a wizard (general installation utility; col. 5, lines 14-16) including a common driver (installation data profile; col. 5, lines 51-52), which when identified to the driver ID demander's requirement to identify one of the plurality interface (the first installation data profile ... actual installation of a device driver; col. 6, lines 1-24 and upon selection of an option ... installation is proceeding; col. 7, lines 3-27).

9. **As to claim 27**, Merkin teaches the common driver comprises a do-nothing driver (device driver program; col. 5, lines 16-20).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2126

11. Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Merkin (U.S. 5,715,463).

12. **As to claim 6**, Merkin teaches installing a first installation data profile (the first installation data profile file is parsed; col. 6, lines 10-11, the installation options available are constructed and displayed to the user in a menu; col. 6, lines 46-47 and The installation data profile ... by the data profiles; col. 7, lines 8-20), deinstalling the first installation data profile (If no errors ... the calling program; col. 8, lines 37-42), installing an operative device driver which enables the newly-installed hardware device and the system to operate together (upon selection of a target driver ... is proceeding; col. 7, lines 20-24).

13. However, Merkin does not explicitly teach the first device driver. It is noted in the specification that the first device driver is not necessary a driver in the strictest Windows sense of the word, and it could be an information file, setup application file, etc.

14. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the installation data profile could be called device driver in light of the specification.

15. **As to claim 7**, Merkin teaches the first device driver does not enable the hardware device and the system to operate together (An IDP file ... for use with the installation; col. 5, lines 1-8).

Art Unit: 2126

16. **As to claim 8**, Merkin teaches receiving a request to identify the operative device driver from among a plurality of possible device driver (The installation data profile ... and driver for the device driver; col. 7, lines 3-27 and a plurality of device drivers; col. 4, lines 50-59).

17. Claims 1-5, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over of Merkin (U.S. 5,715,463) in view Asselin (U.S. 6,658,489 B1).

18. **As to claim 1**, Merkin teaches (col. 7, lines 3-27) receiving a request to select one of a plurality of available system elements to be installed (The installation data profile ... and driver for the device driver), receiving an identification of a system element (upon selection of a target driver or target path), and installing the one of the plurality of available system elements (installation is proceeding ... copying of the device driver into the appropriate place).

19. However, Merkin does not teach an identification of a first system element which is not of the plurality of available system elements, installing the first system element, and deinstalling the first system element. Asselin teaches installing the first system element (the replacement driver is loaded; col. 4, lines 18-63), and deinstalling the first system element (if an error or incompatibility exists, the replacement driver is unloaded; col. 4, lines 18-63).

20. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Merkin and Asselin because it provides a method to install the correct element that is working for both the system and hardware.

21. **As to claim 2**, Merkin teaches the identification of the system element comprises an indication of a location of the first system element (target path; col. 7, lines 3-27).

22. **As to claim 3**, Merkin teaches the identification of the system element comprises an indication of the filename of the system element (the target drive).

23. **As to claim 4**, Merkin teaches the plurality of system elements comprise a plurality of device drivers (a plurality of device drivers; col. 4, lines 50-59). However, Merkin does not teach the first system element comprises a first device driver having substantially different functionality than the plurality of device drivers. Asselin teaches the first device driver is for a hardware, and incompatible with the system (col. 4, lines 18-47). Because each hardware device has a corresponding device driver, and the first device driver is incompatible with the system, the first device driver having substantially different functionality than the plurality of device driver. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Merkin and Asselin because it provides a method to install device driver in the computer system.

24. **As to claim 5**, Merkin does not teach the first device driver comprises a do-nothing driver. Asselin teaches the first device driver could not be use for the system and the hardware device (col. 7, lines 18-47), it would have been obvious the first device driver comprises a do-nothing driver.

25. **As to claim 19**, it corresponds to the method of claim 1 and is rejected under the same ground of rejection.

26. **As to claim 20**, Merkin teaches prompting the user to gather data (The installation data profile may include several conditional operations allowing for user input; col. 7, lines 3-27) and receiving data from the user (Upon selection of a target driver or target path; col. 7, lines 3-27).

Response to Arguments

27. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8, 19-20, and 26-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

28. In the remarks, Applicant argued in substance that (1) a statement of purpose or intended use is not required in a claim's preamble, and cited MPEP §2111.02, (2) Asselin fails to disclose a method for installing a device driver for a newly-installed hardware device, (3) Merkin does not teach a driver ID demander, (4) the device driver program is not a common driver, (5) Asselin does not teach receiving an identification of a first system element which is not of the plurality of available system elements, and (6) Asselin does not teach a do-nothing driver that is installed and deinstalled to participate in the installation of a different driver.

29. Examiner respectfully traverses Applicant's remarks:

As to the point (1), MPEP §2111.02 does not disclosed that a statement of purpose or intended use is not required in a claim's preamble. The section discloses whether the preamble recitations are structural limitations or mere statements of purpose or use. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

As to the point (2), the limitation is newly amended to include "a newly-installed hardware device", and the claim's limitations are now taught by Merkin.

As to the point (3), Merkin does teach a driver ID demander (see rejection of claim 26 above). For each newly installed hardware, the operating system requires a corresponding driver in order to operate the device. The installation wizard usually is executed by the operating system upon detecting a newly connected device.

As to the point (4), the specification discloses that the common driver is not necessary a driver in the strictest Windows sense of the word, and it could be an information file, setup application file, etc. Therefore, the installation data profile could be the common driver as disclosed by the specification. Also, the common driver has been clarified to indicate the installation data profile.

As to the point (5), although Asselin does not teach "receiving an identification of a first system element which is not of the plurality of available system elements", Asselin teaches installing and deinsalling the first system element, it would have been obvious the identification of the first system must be supplied in order to install it. Because the first system element is a replacement driver, therefore it meets the broad claimed limitation. Applicant should specify what is the definition of "available system element" and "not available system elements" for further consideration.

Art Unit: 2126

As to the point (6), do-nothing drive is not a limitation in the independent claims 1 and 19. Therefore, the arguments are not persuasive.

Conclusion

30. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

31. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Diem K Cao whose telephone number is (703) 305-5220 or (571) 272-3760 (effective November 1st 2004). The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, 9:00AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (703) 305-9678 or (571) 272-3760 (effective

Art Unit: 2126

November 1st 2004). The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents

PO Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Diem Cao


MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100